arXiv:1512.02721v1 [math.RT] 9 Dec 2015

ON THE SLOPES OF SEMISTABLE REPRESENTATIONS OF TAME QUIVERS

XINTIAN WANG

Abstract. Stability conditions play an important role in the study of representations of a quiver. In the present paper, we study semistable representations of quivers. In particular, we describe the slopes of semistable representations of a tame quiver for a fixed stability condition.

1. Introduction and preliminaries

The notion of stability was firstly introduced by Mumford in his work on the geometric invariant theory in 1960s and soon became widely used as a technical tool while constructing moduli varieties. In [13] King set up the semistability and stability in the language of the module category over a finite dimensional algebra, more generally for an arbitrary abelian category.

Let $Q = (Q_0, Q_1)$ be a finite acyclic quiver (i.e., without oriented cycles) with vertex set $I = Q_0$ and arrow set Q_1. Let k be an algebraically closed field and modkQ denote the category of finite dimensional modules over the path algebra kQ (equivalently, finite dimensional representations of Q over k). Following Reineke [14], a stability in modkQ is defined relative to a slope function μ on $\mathbb{N}I\backslash\{0\}$. More precisely, a kQ-module X is called semistable (resp. stable) if $\mu(\mathbf{dim}\, U) \leq \mu(\mathbf{dim}\, X)$ (resp. $\mu(\mathbf{dim} U) < \mu(\mathbf{dim} X)$) for all proper submodules $0 \neq U \subseteq X$, where $\mathbf{dim}\, X$ and $\mathbf{dim}\, U$ denote the dimension vectors of X and U, respectively. In this case, $\mu(\mathbf{dim}\, X)$ is called the slope of X.

For each $a \in \mathbb{Q}$, let mod$^a kQ$ denote the full subcategory of modkQ consisting of semistable kQ-modules of slope a. It is known that each mod$^a kQ$ is an abelian category of modkQ. In case Q is a Dynkin or tame quiver, the subcategory mod$^a kQ$ has been characterized in [10, 11].

The main purpose of the present paper is to describe the slopes of semistable modules of kQ when Q is a tame quiver. This is based on an investigation of the structure of the subcategories mod$^a kQ$.

In the following we briefly review some basic facts about finite dimensional algebras and their representations. We also introduce the stability condition for a finite dimensional algebra. We refer to [1, 3, 9, 6] for more details and complete treatments.

Let k be a field and A be a finite dimensional algebra over k. By mod$A$ we denote the category of all finite dimensional left A-modules. Let I denote the set of isoclasses of simple

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16G20, 16G70.

Key words and phrases. stability condition, slope, tame quiver.

Supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China.

objects in mod$A$, and fix a set $\{S_i \mid i \in I\}$ of representatives of the isoclasses in I. For any $M \in \mathrm{mod}A$, let $[M]$ denote the isoclass of M and $\mathbf{dim}\, M$ the dimension vector of M. More precisely, if $\mathbf{dim}\, M = (x_i)_{i\in I}$, then x_i is the number of composition factors isomorphic to S_i in a composition series of M. Further, set $f_i = \dim {}_k\mathrm{End}\,{}_A(S_i)$.

From now onwards, we always assume that A is hereditary. The Euler form of A is defined by

$$\langle \mathbf{dim}\, M, \mathbf{dim}\, N\rangle = \dim {}_k\mathrm{Hom}\,{}_A(M,N) - \dim {}_k\mathrm{Ext}\,{}^1_A(M,N),$$

where $M, N \in \mathrm{mod}A$. Further, let Γ_A be the Auslander–Reiten quiver of A with the Auslander–Reiten translation $\tau = \tau_A$. A connected component $\mathcal{P}$ in Γ_A is called preprojective (resp. preinjective) if, for each vertex $[M]$ in $\mathcal{P}$, the supremum (resp. infimum) of the lengths of the paths ending (resp. starting) at $[M]$ is finite. Otherwise, it is called regular.

An indecomposable A-module is called preprojective (resp. preinjective) if it belongs to a preprojective (resp. preinjective) component of Γ_A and an arbitrary A-module is called preprojective (resp. preinjective) if it is a direct sum of indecomposable preprojective (resp. preinjective) modules. Otherwise, it is a regular module.

Suppose now that A is of tame type. Let δ be the minimal positive imaginary root of A. Recall from [7] that the defect $\partial(M)$ of a module M is defined to be the integer $\langle \delta, \mathbf{dim}\, M\rangle$. Then an indecomposable module M is preprojective (resp. regular, preinjective) if and only if $\partial(M) < 0$ (resp. $\partial(M) = 0$, $\partial(M) > 0$)

A translation quiver $(\mathcal{T}, \tau)$ is defined to be a stable tube of rank $r \geq 1$ if there is an isomorphism of translation quivers $\mathcal{T} \cong \mathbb{Z}\mathbb{A}_\infty/(\tau^r)$. A stable tube of rank r=1 is defined to be a homogeneous tube; otherwise, it is a non-homogeneous tube. A representation in a stable tube which has only one arrow to and from it is called quasi-simple.

The following result is well known; see [7].

Lemma 1.1. *Let A be a finite dimensional hereditary algebra of tame type. Then the Auslander–Reiten quiver Γ_A of A contains a preprojective component $\mathcal{P}$, a preinjective component $\mathcal{I}$, and a $\mathbb{P}^1(k)$-family $\{\mathcal{T}_\lambda\}$ of stable tubes of which only finitely many ones are non-homogeneous. Moreover, for $\lambda, \lambda' \in \mathbb{P}^1(k)$, we have*

(1) $\mathrm{Hom}\,(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{P}\bigcup \mathcal{T}_\lambda) = 0$ *and* $\mathrm{Hom}\,(\mathcal{T}_\lambda, \mathcal{P}) = 0$,
(2) $\mathrm{Hom}\,(\mathcal{T}_\lambda, \mathcal{T}_{\lambda'}) = 0$ *if* $\lambda \neq \lambda'$.

Take $\theta = (\theta_i)_{i\in I} \in \mathbb{Z}I$ and define a linear form on $\mathbb{Z}I$ by setting $\theta(d) = \sum_{i\in I}\theta_i d_i f_i$ (for simplicity, we still denote by θ the linear form), where $d = (d_i)_{i\in I} \in \mathbb{Z}I$. We call θ a weight for A. The slope function μ on $\mathbb{N}I\backslash\{0\}$ associated to θ is defined by

$$\mu(d) = \frac{\sum\limits_{i\in I}\theta_i d_i f_i}{\sum\limits_{i\in I} d_i f_i}.$$

For each $M \in \mathrm{mod}A$, write $\mu(M)$ for $\mu(\mathbf{dim}\, M)$. A module $M \in \mathrm{mod}A$ is called *semistable* (resp. *stable*) if $\mu(U) \leq \mu(M)$ (resp. $\mu(U) < \mu(M)$) for all proper submodules $0 \neq U \subset M$.

The following two lemmas are well known, see, for example, [14].

Lemma 1.2. *Given a short exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow 0.$$

in mod$A$*, we have*

$$\mu(M) \leq \mu(X) \Longleftrightarrow \mu(X) \leq \mu(N) \Longleftrightarrow \mu(M) \leq \mu(N) \quad \textit{and}$$

$$\min(\mu(M), \mu(N)) \leq \mu(X) \leq \max(\mu(M), \mu(N)).$$

If $\mu(M) = \mu(X) = \mu(N)$*, then* X *is semistable if and only if* M *and* N *are semistable.*

By the above lemma, if $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ with both M_1 and M_2 indecomposable, then M is semistable if and only if M_1 and M_2 are semistable and $\mu(M_1) = \mu(M_2) = \mu(M)$. Hence, for semistable A-modules, it is enough to consider the indecomposable ones.

Lemma 1.3. *Let* $X \in \text{mod}A$*. Then* X *is semistable* (*resp. stable*) *if and only if* $\mu(X) \leq \mu(U)$ (*resp.* $\mu(X) < \mu(U)$) *for all proper quotient modules* U*.*

For each $a \in \mathbb{Q}$, denote by $\text{mod}^a A$ the full subcategory of mod$A$ consisting of semistable A-modules of slope a. By convention, we always assume that $\text{mod}^a A$ consists of the zero module 0.

Lemma 1.4. *For each* $a \in \mathbb{Q}$*, the category* $\text{mod}^a A$ *is an abelian subcategory of* mod$A$ *whose simple objects are the indecomposable stable* A*-modules of slope* a*. Moreover, we have that* $\text{Hom}\,(\text{mod}^a A, \text{mod}^b A) = 0$ *whenever* $a > b$*.*

2. Category of semistable kQ-modules of slope a

In this section, we recall some results from [10, 11] which will be needed in the next section in order to prove our main result.

In the following, we assume that k is an algebraically closed field, Q is an acyclic quiver, and A is the path algebra kQ. Thus, the set I of isoclasses of simple A-modules is identified with the vertex set Q_0, and $f_i = \dim {}_k\text{End}\,{}_A(S_i) = 1$ for all $i \in I$. In case Q is a tame quiver, we denote by δ the minimal positive imaginary root of Q, and let $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ be the preprojective and preinjective components, respectively, and let $\mathcal{R}$ be the union of all tubes of the Auslander–Reiten quiver Γ_A.

We first introduce a different stability notion as follows [9]. Let $\theta = (\theta_i)_{i\in I}$ be a weight for Q. We denote $\theta(\mathbf{dim}\text{M})$ by $\theta(M)$. A module $M \in \text{mod}A$ is called θ-semistable (resp. stable) if $\theta(M) = 0$ and $\theta(U) \leq 0$ (resp. $\theta(U) < 0$) for any proper submodule $0 \neq U \subseteq M$. Finally, by $\text{mod}_\theta A$ we denote the full subcategory of mod$A$ consisting of all the θ-semistable modules.

Lemma 2.1. *Let* $\theta = (\theta_i)_{i\in I}$ *be a weight. Then for each* $a \in \mathbb{Q}$*,* $\text{mod}^a A = \text{mod}_{\theta'} A$*, where* $\theta' = \theta - a\theta_0$ *and* $\theta_0 = (1)_{i\in I}$*. Conversely, for a weight* $\omega = (\omega_i)_{i\in I}$*, there exists a weight* $\theta = (\theta_i)_{i\in I}$ *and* $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ *such that* $\text{mod}_\omega A = \text{mod}^a A$*.*

Proof. By the definition, for a weight $\theta = (\theta_i)_{i\in I}$, if μ is the slope function associated with θ, then $\mu(M) = a$ if and only if $(\theta - a\theta_0)(M) = 0$. Moreover, $\mu(M) \leq a$ if and only if $(\theta - a\theta_0)(M) \leq 0$. This implies the desired statements. □

By [10], we have the following statement.

Theorem 2.2. *Let Q be a tame quiver and $\theta = (\theta_i)_{i\in I}$ be a weight for $A = kQ$. Then for each $a \in \mathbb{Q}$, the subcategory $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ is equivalent to one of the following two categories:*

(1) *the module category $\mathrm{mod}kQ'$ of the path algebra kQ' for a Dynkin or tame quiver Q';*
(2) *the full subcategory $\mathcal{R}'$ consisting of all the regular objects of $\mathrm{mod}kQ'$ with Q' a possibly disconnected tame quiver (i.e., a quiver with one tame component and all other components (if any) Dynkin).*

The following statement is an easy consequence of the above theorem.

Corollary 2.3. *Let Q and Q' be as in Theorem 2.2 with $A = kQ$ and $B = kQ'$. Let $\langle -, - \rangle_B$ and $\langle -, - \rangle_A$ be the Euler forms associated to B and A, respectively. Then for any $M, N \in \mathrm{mod}B$, M, N can be viewed as A-modules and, moreover,*

$$\langle M, N\rangle_B = \langle M, N\rangle_A.$$

Proposition 2.4. *Let Q be a tame quiver and $\theta = (\theta_i)_{i\in I}$ be a weight for $A = kQ$. If there is an indecomposable A-module of dimension vector $m\delta$ in $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ for some $m \geq 1$, then there is an indecomposable A-module of dimension vector δ in $\mathrm{mod}^a A$.*

Proof. Let M be an indecomposable A-module in $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ with $\mathbf{dim}\, M = m\delta$ for some $m \geq 1$. Then M has a submodule N with $\mathbf{dim}\, N = \delta$ which gives an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M/N \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $\mu(N) = \mu(\delta) = \mu(M)$, we have by Lemma 1.4 that N is semistable. Hence, N lies in $\mathrm{mod}^a A$. □

Corollary 2.5. *We keep the notations as in the above proposition and take $a \in \mathbb{Q}$.*

(1) *If $a \neq \mu(\delta)$, then $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{mod}kQ'$, where Q' is a Dynkin quiver.*

(2) *If $\mathrm{mod}^a A \cap \mathcal{P} \neq \varnothing$ or $\mathrm{mod}^a A \cap \mathcal{I} \neq \varnothing$, then $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{mod}kQ'$, where Q' is a Dynkin or tame quiver. Moreover, if $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ contains an indecomposable module with dimension vector δ, then Q' is a tame quiver. Otherwise, Q' is a Dynkin quiver.*

(3) *If $\mathrm{mod}^a A \subset \mathcal{R}$, and has no indecomposable object with dimension δ, then $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{mod}kQ'$, where Q' is a Dynkin quiver.*

(4) *If $\mathrm{mod}^a A \subset \mathcal{R}$, and has an indecomposable object with dimension δ, then $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ is equivalent to the full subcategory consisting of all the regular objects of $\mathrm{mod}kQ'$, where Q' is a possibly disconnected tame quiver.*

Proof. (1) Suppose that $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{mod}kQ'$, where Q' is a tame quiver. By Corollary 2.3, there is an indecomposable module M in $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ with $\mathbf{dim}\, M = m\delta$ for some $m \geq 1$. Then $a = \mu(M) = \mu(m\delta) = \mu(\delta)$, which is a contradiction. Similarly, $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ is not equivalent to the full subcategory consisting of all the regular objects of $\mathrm{mod}kQ'$, where Q' is a possibly disconnected tame quiver. The statement follows from Theorem 2.2.

(2) For the first statement, suppose that $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{R}'$, where $\mathcal{R}'$ denotes the full subcategory consisting of all the regular objects of modkQ' with Q' a possibly disconnected tame quiver. Let δ' be the minimal positive imaginary root of Q' and take $M \in \mathcal{R}'$ with $\mathbf{dim}M = \delta'$. Then for all N in $\mathrm{mod}^a A$,

$$\langle M, N\rangle_A = \langle M, N\rangle_B = 0.$$

Here M, N are viewed as both A-modules and B-modules. But since $\mathrm{mod}^a A \cap \mathcal{P} \neq \varnothing$ or $\mathrm{mod}^a A \cap \mathcal{I} \neq \varnothing$, there exists a module $N_0 \in \mathrm{mod}^a A$ such that $\langle M, N_0\rangle_A \neq 0$, a contradiction. The second statement follows from Corollary 2.3.

(3) By Proposition 2.4, there exists no indecomposable module in $\mathrm{mod}^a A$ with dimension vector $m\delta, m \geq 1$. Then the statement follows from Corollary 2.3 and Theorem 2.2.

(4) The proof is similar to (2).

□

3. The slopes of semistable kQ-modules

In this section, we describe the slopes of semistable kQ-modules in case Q is a tame quiver. The main result is stated in Theorem 3.6. We keep all the notations in the previous section. In particular, $Q = (I = Q_0, Q_1)$ denotes an acyclic quiver and $A = kQ$ is the path algebra of Q over an algebraically closed field.

We denote by $\mathrm{mod}^{ss} A$ the full subcategory of mod$A$ consisting of semistable A-modules. Hence, $\mathrm{mod}^{ss} A = \cup_{a\in\mathbb{Q}} \mathrm{mod}^a A$. For a weight $\theta = (\theta_i)_{i\in I}$ for A, define

$$\mathscr{X}_\theta = \{a \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \mathrm{mod}^a A \ \text{ is non-zero}\}.$$

Our main aim in this section is to describe the set $\mathscr{X}_\theta$ in case Q is a tame quiver. First of all, we have the following facts in some special cases.

Proposition 3.1. (1) $|\mathscr{X}_\theta| = 1$ *if and only if all A-modules are semistable, i.e.* $\mathrm{mod}^{ss} A =$ mod$A$. *In other words, all θ_i, $i \in I$, coincide.*

(2) $|\mathscr{X}_\theta| = 2$ *if and only if Q contains two full subquivers $Q' = (Q'_0, Q'_1)$ and $Q'' = (Q''_0, Q''_1)$ such that $Q_0 = Q'_0 \cup Q''_0$ and there are no arrows from Q''_0 to Q'_0 and $\theta_{i_1} = \theta_{j_1} < \theta_{i_2} = \theta_{j_2}$ for all $i_1, j_1 \in Q'_0, i_2, j_2 \in Q''_0$.*

Proof. (1) Since each simple module S_i is semistable, it follows that $\theta_i = \mu(S_i) \in \mathscr{X}_\theta$. Thus, if $|\mathscr{X}_\theta| = 1$, then $\theta_i = \theta_j$ for all $i \neq j \in Q_0$. This implies that the slopes of all A-modules are equal. Therefore, all A-modules are semistable.

Conversely, assume that all A-modules are semistable. Suppose $|\mathscr{X}_\theta| > 1$, i.e., there are $i, j \in Q_0$ such that $\theta_i \neq \theta_j$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\theta_i < \theta_j$. This implies that the semisimple module $S_i \oplus S_j$ is not semistable. This is a contradiction. Hence, $|\mathscr{X}_\theta| = 1$.

(2) Suppose $|\mathscr{X}_\theta| = 2$, say $\mathscr{X}_\theta = \{a, b\}$ with $a < b$. Set

$$Q'_0 = \{i \in I \mid \theta_i = a\} \ \text{ and } \ Q''_0 = \{i \in I \mid \theta_i = b\}.$$

Let Q' and Q'' be the full subquivers of Q with vertex sets Q'_0 and Q''_0, respectively. Then Q_0 is the disjoint union of Q'_0 and Q''_0. Suppose there is an arrow $j \longrightarrow i$ with $i \in Q'_0$ and $j \in Q''_0$. Consider the indecomposable A-module M with socle S_i and $M/S_i \cong S_j$. Then M

is semistable and $\mu(\mathbf{dim}\, M) = (a+b)/2 \in \mathscr{X}_\theta$. This contradicts the assumption $\mathscr{X}_\theta = \{a, b\}$ since $a < (a+b)/2 < b$. Therefore, there are no arrows from Q_0'' to Q_0'.

The converse follows from the fact that each semistable A-module is either a kQ'-module or a kQ''-module. □

From now onwards, we assume that Q is a (connected) tame quiver which is obtained from a (connected) Dynkin quiver Γ of type A, D, E by adding a vertex. This gives symmetric Cartan matrices C_Q and C_Γ of Q and Γ, respectively. Thus, we have the associated Kac–Moody Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}(C_Q)$ and $\mathfrak{g}(C_\Gamma)$. Let Δ_0 and Δ_0^+ be the set of real roots and the set of positive real roots of $\mathfrak{g}(C_\Gamma)$, respectively. By [12], the set of positive real roots of $\mathfrak{g}(C_Q)$ can be described as

$$\Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}} = \{\alpha + n\delta \mid \alpha \in \Delta_0, n \geq 1\} \cup \Delta_0^+,$$

and its set of imaginary roots is $\Delta^{\mathrm{im}} = \mathbb{Z}\delta \backslash \{0\}$, where δ denotes the minimal positive imaginary root of Q.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the preprojective component of the Auslander–Reiten quiver of $A = kQ$. By [15], the dimension vectors of $P \in \mathcal{P}$ are positive real roots of $\mathfrak{g}(C_Q)$. Let $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_N$ be all the indecomposable preprojective A-modules, up to isomorphism, with $\mathbf{dim}\, P_i = \alpha_i < \delta$. For each $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathbf{dim}\, P = \alpha + n\delta$, with $\alpha \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ and $\alpha < \delta$. Then $0 > \partial(P) = \langle \delta, \alpha + n\delta \rangle = \langle \delta, \alpha \rangle$. Thus, the indecomposable module X with $\mathbf{dim}\, X = \alpha$ is preprojective. Hence, $X \cong P_i$ and $\alpha = \alpha_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq N$, i.e., $\mathbf{dim}\, P = \alpha_i + n\delta$.

The following fact is well known.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $M \in \mathcal{P}$. Then there exists $m \gg 0$ such that for each projective module P, $\mathrm{Hom}_A(M, \tau^{-n}P) \neq 0$ whenever $n \geq m$.*

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose $M \in \mathcal{P}$ is semistable satisfying $\mu(P_i) \leq \mu(M)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N$ and $\mu(\delta) < \mu(M)$. Then there are only finitely many semistable modules in $\mathcal{P}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, there is $m \gg 0$ such that for each projective module P and $m \geq n$, $\mathrm{Hom}_A(M, \tau^{-m}P) \neq 0$. We can assume that $\mathbf{dim}\, \tau^{-m}P > \delta$. This implies that $\mu(M) > \mu(\tau^{-m}P)$. By Lemma 1.4, $\tau^{-m}P$ is not semistable. Therefore, there are only finitely many semistable modules in $\mathcal{P}$. □

Now we recall some facts about the regular A-modules from [4, 5, 15]. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tube of rank r in the Auslander–Reiten quiver of A. Let $E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_r$ be the quasi-simple modules in $\mathcal{T}$ with $\tau(E_i) = E_{i+1}, 1 \leq i \leq r$, where $E_{r+1} = E_1$. Let $E_{i,j}$ denote the indecomposable module in $\mathcal{T}$ with quasi-length j and quasi-socle E_i. It is known that $E_{i,j}$ is regular uniserial with regular composition factors of the form $E_i, \tau^{-1}E_i, \ldots, \tau^{-(r-1)}E_i$ and $\mathbf{dim} E_{i,j} = \mathbf{dim}\, E_{i,j_0} + n\delta$, where $j = j_0 + nr$ for some $0 \leq j_0 < r$ and $n \geq 0$. We have the following known fact.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $m \geq 1$. Then for any $1 \leq s \leq r$ and $m\delta \leq j < (m+1)\delta$,*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_A(E_{i,m\delta}, E_{s,j}) \neq 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{Hom}_A(E_{s,j}, E_{i,(m+1)\delta}) \neq 0.$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Assume that $\mathbf{dim}\, P = \alpha_i + n\delta$ and M is a submodule of P with $\mathbf{dim}\, M = \alpha_j + n'\delta$, where $1 \leq i, j \leq N$. Then $n' \leq n$.*

Proof. Suppose $n' > n$. Since $\mathbf{dim} M = \alpha_j + n'\delta < \mathbf{dim}\, P = \alpha_i + n\delta$, it follows that $(n'-n)\delta \leq \alpha_i - \alpha_j$. But $(n'-n)\delta$ is positive and sincere. This is impossible. Therefore, $n' \leq n$. □

Now we state our main theorem.

Theorem 3.6. (1) *If $\mathrm{mod}^{\mu(\delta)} A$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{mod}kQ'$, where Q' is a Dynkin or tame quiver, then $\mathscr{X}_\theta$ is a finite set.*

(2) *If $\mathrm{mod}^{\mu(\delta)} A$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{R}'$, where $\mathcal{R}'$ is the regular part of $\mathrm{mod}kQ'$ for a (possibly disconnected) tame quiver Q', then $\mathscr{X}_\theta$ is an infinite set.*

Proof. (1) Let $\mathcal{X}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}_2$) be the set of isomorphism classes of indecomposable semistable A-modules M (resp. with $\mu(M) \neq \mu(\delta)$). According to Theorem 2.2(1), we need to consider the following two cases.

Case 1. Q' is a Dynkin quiver.

We first show that $\mathcal{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}$ is finite. Indeed, by Corollary 2.5, each module in a homogeneous tube is not semistable. Hence, there exists $P \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mu(P) > \mu(\delta)$. By the discussion right above Lemma 3.2, we get that $\mu(\delta) < \mu(P_i)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq N$. Choose $1 \leq s \leq N$ satisfying $\mu(P_j) \leq \mu(P_s)$ for any $1 \leq j \leq N$. By Lemma 3.5, P_s is semistable. Hence, by Lemma 3.3, there are only finitely many semistable modules in $\mathcal{P}$.

Next we show that $\mathcal{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{R}$ is finite. By Corollary 2.5, A-modules with dimension vector $m\delta$ are not semistable. So we only need to consider the non-homogeneous tubes. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a non-homogeneous tube of rank r. As before, for $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $j \geq 1$, let $E_{i,j}$ be the indecomposable module in $\mathcal{T}$ with quasi-length j and quasi-socle E_i. Then

$$\mathbf{dim}\, E_{i,j} = \mathbf{dim}\, E_{i,j_0} + n\delta \ \text{ with } j = j_0 + nr,\ 0 \leq j_0 < r, \text{ and } n \geq 1.$$

If $\mu(E_{i,j_0}) = \mu(\delta)$, then there exists a submodule N of $E_{i,\delta}$ satisfying $\mu(N) > \mu(E_{i,\delta}) = \mu(E_{i,j})$ since $E_{i,\delta}$ is not semistable. Hence, $E_{i,j}$ is not semistable because N is also a submodule of $E_{i,j}$.

If $\mu(E_{i,j_0}) \neq \mu(\delta)$, say $\mu(E_{i,j_0}) < \mu(\delta)$, then $\mu(E_{i,j_0}) < \mu(E_{i,j}) < \mu(\delta) = \mu(E_{i,\delta})$, which implies that $E_{i,j}$ is not semistable since $E_{i,\delta}$ is a submodule of $E_{i,j}$.

Consequently, each module in $\mathcal{T}$ with quasi-length $\geq r$ is not semistable. Therefore, there are only finitely many semistable modules in $\mathcal{R}$.

By Lemma 1.3 and an argument similar to the proof for the case of $\mathcal{P}$, we get that $\mathcal{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}$ is finite.

Case 2. Q' is a tame quiver.

We first show that $\mathcal{X}_2 \cap \mathcal{P}$ is finite. We will prove that for $m \gg 0$ and each projective module P, if $M = \tau^{-m} P \notin \mathrm{mod}^{\mu(\delta)} A$, then M is not semistable. In fact, suppose M is semistable. Let $L \in \mathrm{mod}^{\mu(\delta)} A \cap \mathcal{P}$ satisfy $\mathrm{Hom}\,(L, M) \neq 0$. Since $kQ' \cong \mathrm{mod}^{\mu(\delta)} A$ has an infinite preprojective component, $\mathrm{mod}^{\mu(\delta)} A \cap \mathcal{P}$ is infinite. By Proposition 3.2, there exists

$N_1 \in \mathrm{mod}^{\mu(\delta)}A \cap \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathrm{Hom}\,(M, N_1) \neq 0$. Thus,

$$\mu(\delta) = \mu(L) \leq \mu(M) \leq \mu(N_1) = \mu(\delta),$$

which implies $\mu(M) = \mu(\delta)$ and $M \in \mathrm{mod}^{\mu(\delta)}A$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\mathcal{X}_2 \cap \mathcal{P}$ is finite.

Next we show that $\mathcal{X}_2 \cap \mathcal{R}$ is finite. Since A-modules with dimension vector $m\delta$ do not lie in $\mathcal{X}_2$, we only need to consider the non-homogenous tubes. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a non-homogenous tube of rank r. As in Case 1, for $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $j \geq 1$, $\mathbf{dim}E_{i,j} = \mathbf{dim}E_{i,j_0} + n\delta$ with $j = j_0 + nr$, $0 \leq j_0 < r$, and $n \geq 1$. Suppose that $E_{i,j} \notin \mathrm{mod}^{\mu(\delta)}A$. By Proposition 3.4, $\mathrm{Hom}\,(E_{i,m\delta}, E_{i,j}) \neq 0$ and $\mathrm{Hom}\,(E_{i,j}, E_{i,(m+1)\delta}) \neq 0$.

If $E_{i,m\delta}$ is not semistable, then $E_{i,j}$ is not semistable by an argument similar to Case 1.

If $E_{i,m\delta}$ is semistable, then $E_{i,(m+1)\delta}$ is semistable and

$$\mu(\delta) = \mu(E_{i,m\delta}) \leq \mu(E_{i,j}) \leq \mu(E_{i,(m+1)\delta}) = \mu(\delta),$$

which implies that $\mu(E_{i,j}) = \mu(\delta)$. Since $E_{i,j} \notin \mathrm{mod}^{\mu(\delta)}A$, $E_{i,j}$ is not semistable.

In conclusion, the modules in $\mathcal{T}$ with quasi-length $\geq r$ do not belong to $\mathcal{X}_2$. Hence, there are only finitely many indecomposable modules in $\mathcal{X}_2 \cap \mathcal{R}$.

Similarly, we get that $\mathcal{X}_2 \cap \mathcal{I}$ is finite.

(2) We will construct a family of semistable modules $\{P^i_{j_i}\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying

$$\mu(P^i_{j_i}) < \mu(P^{i+1}_{j_{i+1}}) < \mu(\delta).$$

By Corollary 2.5, there exists an indecomposable semistable module M with $\mathbf{dim}\,M = \delta$. Choose $1 \leq j_0 \leq N$ satisfying $\mu(P_j) \leq \mu(P_{j_0})$ for all $1 \leq j \leq N$. Write $P^0_{j_0}$ for P_{j_0}. By Lemma 3.5, $P^0_{j_0}$ is semistable. Since $\mathrm{Hom}\,(P^0_{j_0}, M) \neq 0$, we have $\mu(P^0_{j_0}) \leq \mu(M) = \mu(\delta)$. Since $P^0_{j_0} \notin \mathrm{mod}^{\mu(\delta)}A$, $\mu(P^0_{j_0}) < \mu(M) = \mu(\delta)$. Let $P^1_1, P^1_2, \ldots, P^1_N$ be the preprojective modules in $\mathcal{P}$ with $\mathbf{dim}P^1_i = \alpha_i + \delta$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$, where $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N$ are defined right above Lemma 3.2. Let $1 \leq j_1 \leq N$ satisfy $\mu(P^1_j) \leq \mu(P^1_{j_1})$ for all $1 \leq j \leq N$. Since

$$\mu(P^1_{j_1}) \geq \mu(P^1_{j_0}) > \mu(P^0_{j_0}) \geq \mu(P_i), 1 \leq i \leq N,$$

we have by Lemma 3.5 that $P^1_{j_1}$ is semistable. Repeating the above process, we finally get a family of semistable modules $\{P^i_{j_i}\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying $\mu(P^i_{j_i}) < \mu(P^{i+1}_{j_{i+1}}) < \mu(\delta)$. Hence, $\{\mu(P^i_{j_i})\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathscr{X}_\theta$ and $\mathscr{X}_\theta$ is infinite.

□

Example 3.7. Let Q be the tame quiver of type $\widetilde{A}_3$ with $A = kQ$:

$Q:$



It is known that $\delta = (1, 1, 1, 1)$.

(1) Take $\theta = (1, 1, 2, 0)$. An easy calculation shows that

$$\mathscr{X}_\theta = \{0, 1/2, 2/3, 1, 2\}.$$

Moreover, $\mu(\delta) = 1$ and $\mathrm{mod}^1 A$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{mod}k\Gamma$, where Γ is a tame quiver of type $\widetilde{A}_2$.

(2) Take $\theta = (1, 2, 3, 2)$. An easy calculation shows that

$$\mathscr{X}_\theta = \{1, 2, 5/2, 3\}.$$

Moreover, $\mu(\delta) = 2$ and $\mathrm{mod}^2 A$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{mod}k\Gamma$, where Γ is a Dynkin quiver of type A_2.

(3) Take $\theta = (3, 2, 2, 1)$. Then

$$\{(8n + 5)/(4n + 3) \mid n \geq 0\} \subseteq \mathscr{X}_\theta.$$

Hence, $\mathscr{X}_\theta$ is infinite. Moreover, $\mu(\delta) = 2$ and $\mathrm{mod}^2 A$ consists of all the regular A-modules.

Acknowledgements

The author is very grateful to Professor Bangming Deng for his encouragement and careful guidance. We also thank Shiquan Ruan, Qinghua Chen and Jie Zhang for many helpful discussions and concerns.

References

[1] I. Assem, D. Simson and A. Skowronski, *Elements of the representation theory of associative algebras 1*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, Vol. 65, Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[2] I. Assem and A. Skowronski, *Elements of the representation theory of associative algebras 2*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, Vol. 71, Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[3] M. Auslander, I. Reiten and S. Smalø, *Representation theory of artin algebras*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Vol. 36, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[4] W. Crawley-Boevey, *Lectures on representation of quivers*, see http://www1.maths.leeds.ac.uk/∼pmtwc/quivlecs.pdf

[5] W. Crawley-Boevey, *More lectures on representation of quivers*, see http://www1.maths.leeds.ac.uk/∼pmtwc/morequivlecs.pdf

[6] B. Deng, J. Du, B. Parshall and J. Wang, *Finite dimensional algebras and quantum groups*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Vol. 150, American Mathematical Society, 2008.

[7] V. Dlab and C. M. Ringel, *Indecomposable representations of graphs and algebras*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., **6**(1976).

[8] P. Gabriel and A.V. Roiter, *Representations of Finite-dimensional Algebras*, Translated from the Russian, with a chapter by B. Keller. Reprint of the 1992 English translation, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.

[9] L. Hille and J. A. D. L. Pena, *Stable representations of quivers*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra. **172** (2002), 205–224.

[10] C. Ingalls, C. Paquette and H. Thomas, *Semi-stable subcategories for Euclidean quivers*, arXiv: 1212.1424v2.

[11] C. Ingalls and H. Thomas, *Noncrossing partitions and representations of quivers*, Compos. Math., **145** (2009), 1533–1562.

[12] V. G. Kac, *Infinite dimensional Lie algebras*, 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[13] A. D. King, *Moduli of representations of finite dimensioal algebras*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2), **45** (1994), 515–530.

[14] M. Reineke, *The Harder-Narasimham system in quantum groups and cohomology of quiver moduli*, Invent. Math. **152** (2003), 349–368.

[15] C. M. Ringel, *Representations of K-species and bimodules*, J. Algebra, **41** (1976), 269–302.

School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China.
E-mail address: wangxintian0916@126.com